UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/803,514	03/08/2001	Sridhar Obilisetty	026507-000300US	6110
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER			EXAMINER	
			VU, TUAN A	
EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2193	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/03/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/803,514	OBILISETTY, SRIDHAR	
Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ait Oille	

	10/114/1. 40	2100				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 20 February 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION	N FOR ALLOWANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Application (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affi eal (with appeal fee) in complia	davit, or other evidence, which places the nce with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request	е			
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or a	ater than SIX MONTHS from the m (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN	nailing date of the final rejection.				
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFI tension and the corresponding amoshortened statutory period for reply than three months after the mailin	ount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee originally set in the final Office action; or (2) a	as			
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41 37 must	t be filed within two months of the date of	F			
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e))), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co	nsideration and/or search (see					
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in beta appeal; and/or 	•	y reducing or simplifying the issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1	-	/ rejected claims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21. See attached Notice of Nor	n-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	:					
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling non-allowable claim(s).						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-6 and 8-25. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		will be entered and an explanation of				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			t			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under a y and was not earlier presented	ppeal and/or appellant fails to provide a l. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).				
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims aft	er entry is below or attached.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	t does NOT place the application	on in condition for allowance because:				
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	_				
	/Tuan A Vu/					
	Examiner, Art Unit 2	193				

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed changes after final require reconsideration and possible search, hence would not simplify effects on a potential Appeal, thus will not be entered. The arguments regarding the meaning of 'independently' remain moot in view of the Final Action interpretation of this term. The argument involving a agent for compiling is deemed not part of any of the recited subject matter being addressed previously. The rest of the arguments raise the issue that once Bloch's AVM terminates the other short-lived runtime calls or tasklist would also terminate, hence the portions cited in Bloch would not qualify as being 'independent' from the resident application. Absent any specifics regarding how this 'independently' is implemented, the Examiner's rebuttal as set forth in sections A-C of the last 'Response to Arguments' section will stand. For example, as long as the runtime resources of the AVM is not interrupted by the calls or user task with remote DB invocations, the runtime memory/flow of the AVM is considered not drastically affected by the underlying tasks, which makes the achieving of those user's tasks or DB calls independent from the main context of the AVM. Nowhere does the claimed language (i.e. "independently from") enforces a stiff form of independency to preclude the Office's interpretation from using Bloch; that is, a requirement - for example - in terms that as soon as the OS resident program terminates, the user's application based on the text files continue to deploy - or vice versa. The claims as previously rejected stand non-allowable, and the changes as proposed in this response will not entered .